

Trade 4.15.0.12 5
D E F E N C E

OF A
PAMPHLET lately Published:

ENTITLED,
T H O U G H T S

UPON
Several interesting SUBJECTS

V I Z.
On the Exportation of, and Bounty upon
CORN. On the high Price of Provi-
sions. On Manufactures, Commerce, &c.

BEING
A REPLY to the APPENDIX,

ANNEXED TO
The Expediency of a free Exportation
of Corn at this Time;

I N
Which the Misrepresentation, false Reasoning,
and wilful Deceit of the said Author, is
fully exposed, and refuted:

I N
A SECOND LETTER to a FRIEND.

By Mr. W I M P E Y.

L O N D O N:

Sold by S. Crowder, in Pater Noster Row; and
J. Willis, Bookseller, at Newbury,

[Price One Shilling.]

12 Aug. 1770

THE
THOUGHTS
OF A
LATELY PUBLISHED
ENTERTAINING

Several interesting
On the high Price of
On the high Price of
On the high Price of



A REPLY
The
of Corn in this time

Which the
and which
the

A Second Letter to a Friend

By Mr. W. M. P. A.

LONDON

Sold by S. G. ... in ...

Price One Shilling

as
the
as
per
of
tic
pro
for
sho

T H E
P R E F A C E.

THE corn trade is, and has long been, perhaps, as interesting and important an article to the public, as any article whatever ; especially if into the idea be taken the culture, as well as the exportation thereof. The prosperous state of which concerns the good of every individual ; but there are particular classes of men upon whom its prosperity immediately depend, and therefore 'tis for the general good that they should have the truest, clearest, and most

precise notions concerning it. These are first the legislative ; then the land owner ; the farmer, or occupier ; and, lastly, the mealman, factor, and merchant. All are subordinate to the first, as they must act in conformity to such laws and regulations, as they may from time to time think most expedient and fit to enact, for the general good. The subject is generally thought to be attended with much difficulty, and mankind seem much divided in their opinions concerning it : but to me it seems clear, that the difficulties arise chiefly from the prejudices of the writers, and not from the subject ; wou'd people enter dispassionately and candidly into the enquiry, and discuss the question with that impartiality truth requires, I think the difficulties wou'd soon disappear, and the public wou'd be at no loss what measures to pursue for the general good.

The following sheets were wrote in defence of a pamphlet published some
little

little time since, * which was in answer to another pamphlet lately published†. Tho' these were wrote professedly on this subject, they by no means convey that intelligence I cou'd wish; at least it must be picked up here and there as 'tis to be met with, but not without labour and care. The author of the expedience having adopted the notion, that the giving a bounty on the exportation of corn, is the true and only measure upon which the whole success of the corn trade depends: he has used every argument to support and defend that notion, that his whole art cou'd devise, without the least regard to truth, whenever it appeared unfavourable to his darling principle. So that this controversy relates chiefly, to what he had advanced in support of that notion: but I apprehend, a much clearer opinion of the subject may be acquired,

* Thoughts on several interesting subjects, &c.

† The expediency of a free exportation, &c.

by

by an impartial enquiry into facts traced from the reign of Charles the First, which I shall attempt in the clearest, but shortest manner I can.

The only table of the prices of wheat for any long time back, is the table publish'd by Bishop Fleetwood, from the books at Eaton college, and since continued by others: this table furnishes us with the prices at Windsor market from the year 1646. From whence it appears, that in the years 1648 and 1649, the price of wheat was higher than at any other time, within the compass of the table; that the prices should be so high then, cannot be a matter of surprize, when it is considered how great the distresses were, under which the nation in general groaned at that unfortunate time. But peace being restored, people betook themselves to their former occupations, and things went on in their usual course. The husbandman cultivated and cropped his land, which producing plenty, the prices soon became more moderate. The legislature at that

that time thought it their duty and interest to take care of the interest of the farmer, upon whose success their own so visibly depended : that in the fifteenth year of Charles the Second, they laid a duty of 5s. 4d. on the importation of wheat, with a view to prevent the price from falling so low as to distress the farmer. Seven years after, viz. in the twenty-second of the same reign, 'twas thought expedient to increase the duties on importation to 16s. per quarter : this, in fact, nearly amounted to a prohibition, and was certainly intended for the benefit of the farmer and land owner, by preventing the importation of foreign corn, and thereby an immoderate fall of the price at home.

But it has been asserted by some, that these high duties operated differently from what was plainly intended ; and instead of keeping up the price of corn, it has been the means of falling the price ; in the same manner the bounty has been supposed to have done since ;

which

which measure was likewise adopted, with a visible intention to promote the interest of the farmer, and land owner; and therefore if those measures have been the cause of falling, and keeping down the price, they have acted contrary to the original intention of the legislature, and may be truly said to have defeated the very ends they were calculated to serve; for surely a farmer must have had a much more powerful motive to cultivate wheat, when the average price for twenty five years together was £ 2. 8s. than when the average price in an after period of the same length was only £ 1. 18s. let the cause of such decline of price be what you please. But let us examine the state of things at that time.

In 1657 the price of wheat was £ 2. 6s. 8d. in 1758 £ 3. 5s. in 1759 £ 3. 6s. in 1660 £ 2. 16s. 6d. in 1661 £ 3. 10s. in 1662 £ 3. 14s. in 1663 £ 2. 17s. and in 1764, it fell to £ 2. 0s. 6d. now this is the very year the duties was first laid on importation, and visibly oc-
casi-

rasioned by such a large and very sudden fall of price. We have no certain accounts of the quantities imported at that time, but probably 'twas considerable, or it had not become an object of the legislature; 'tis also evident, that great fall of price cou'd be owing to nothing, but a very plentiful year, which certainly gave birth to a duty on importation: in 1665, the price was £ 2. 9s. 4d. an advance of price in one year from the commencement of the duties of 8s. 10d. per quarter: the two following years the price was down at £ 1. 16s. and from that time to 1673, the prices run from £ 2. to £ 2. 6s. 8d. In 1671, the high duties on importation commenced; in 1673 the price advanced to £ 2. 6s. 8d. in 1674 to £ 3. 8s. 8d. in 1675 the price was £ 3. 4s. 8d. From hence it seems clearly to appear, that the certain and immediate effects of high duties was a very great advance of price. In 1676 the price fell to £ 1. 18s. which cou'd be owing to nothing but a plentiful season again; in 1677 it got up to £ 2. 2s. in 1678 to £ 2. 19s. and in 1679 to

b

£ 3.

£ 3. From this time to 1686, the price was upon an average, at about £ 2. 4s. In 1686 it fell to £ 1. 14s. and in 1687 to £ 1. 5s. 2d. I believe 'twill be readily allowed, such very low prices could not possibly be occasioned by any thing but a great plenty in the years 1686 and 1687; and that those very low prices suggested to the legislature; the expediency of granting a bounty on exportation the year following, in order to advance the price of corn, with a view to incourage and benefit the farmer. That the legislature judged right in this measure most certainly appears from what followed; for the very same year the bounty was first granted, the price advanced from £ 1. 5s. 2d. to £ 2. 6s. the three following years the price was rather low, probably a plenty, and no demand abroad; but from and after 1691 to 1699, a space of eight years, the average price was £ 3. 1s. 10d. a price so high, that no eight years taken together any where in the table for one hundred and seventy years, does by any means equal it; the eight years including the civil

civil war only excepted, and the price then, tho' the nation was in such immense distress, only exceeded it by seven pence half penny a quarter, not quite one penny a bushel. This being the case, does it not amount to an absolute certainty; that high duties on importation, and a bounty on exportation does most infallibly advance the price of corn.

But admitting the bounty to have been a proper and fit measure at that time; it does by no means follow, it must ever continue so. The expediency of that measure might arise from circumstances, that may have long since ceased to exist; and if such circumstances did then exist, and made that measure expedient and fit, and does not now exist, (which is certainly the truth), then that measure is no longer expedient and fit, and therefore should no longer exist neither.

To clear up this point, I conceive nothing more is necessary, than to state fairly the general condition and circum-

stance of the farmer, at, and for many years after the bounty took place; and the present state and condition of the farmer, extending it backward for forty or fifty years.—Perhaps a fair comparison made between their general circumstances, taken at those two distant periods, may clearly lead us to a solution of the question.

Many men now living well remember farmers a set of hard working laborious people; them and their families meanly clothed, fed upon plain and cheap diet; in short, were forced to use the utmost frugality in all respects, to pay their rents, and live; their circumstances generally such as required their selling their corn as soon as they cou'd get it to market, tho' 'twas ever so cheap. But it now may be said with great truth as well as pleasure, that in all improved counties, they are become quite a different sort of men; and live more like their landlords than themselves. This is no reflection, they can afford to do it,

it, their circumstances are equal to it: In their dress, they and their families are rather elegant than decent; so are they in their furniture; their house keeping, their horses, and every thing about them; and can most of them in years of plenty set up their wheat reeks, &c. and keep them 'till they can sell at a price that please them. The question then is, what has wrought this surprising, this pleasing change? not a fall of rents, for those in many places has advanced a fourth, a third, and some more; therefore that acts negatively; nor can it be a higher price of wheat, that, from the history of the times is lower, and acts in the same manner. The truth is, agriculture is become a science, men of all degrees and stations have studied it for many years past, and from their joint labours and endeavours many great and valuable practises have been brought into use; to such improvements then are we to ascribe plenty, and to plenty riches. That the advantages the nation has reaped by the corn trade arises from such improvements; may clearly appear from

from a comparison to be made between any country where such improvement has taken place, and any other where it has not. In the first you will find the farmer, the opulent, respectable man of consequence I have said; in the other, you'll find him in that poor, mean, abject state, leading a life of slavery, for want of a capacity, or through other inability for improvement. In one country you'll find rents advanced 20, 30, 40, and 50% per cent. and the occupier growing rich: in the other, (one estate I know in particular, that in 1711 the rental was about £ 1270 per annum, and in 1768 no more than £ 1099,) their rents are upon the decline for want of such advantageous, culture, and improvement; tho' as capable of it as any land in England.

Now from this view of things, let us see of what use a bounty can be to the nation. It's advocates assign two reasons; one is, it causes a greater regularity of price, which is a matter of great convenience to the farmer, who is represented

sented as being under a necessity of selling as soon as he can get it to market. The first assertion is disproved by the Windsor table, where it clearly appears, the prices have been full as irregular and both higher and lower since the bounty than they ever were before; the two years of the civil war only excepted: and it appears as above, the farmer in improved counties, is no longer the indigent man he is represented; but able to keep his corn 'till he finds it his interest to sell it; which shews the first reason assigned has no foundation. The second reason assigned is, that it encourages the farmer to plant more corn than he would otherwise do. — But if this proves any thing, it proves too much; because they say the bounty has occasioned the fall of price; if so, they make a low price a more powerful inducement to the farmer to plant wheat than a higher price, which is a contradiction in terms. But let me ask any candid man; suppose a farmer rents an estate of £ 30, 50, 100, or £ 500 a year, will he not cultivate and plant it in such manner as he thinks most

most conducive to his interest, whether any bounty be given on exportation, or not: Surely no one will deny this; all then a bounty can do, is to bribe him, suppose, to plant wheat, where he otherwise wou'd not have thought of it; that is, where it is not proper he should plant it; and therefore with respect to himself wou'd be a real loss, if not made good by the public, in which case the loss is transferred from himself to the public; who then is the gainer? certainly the foreign customer, for he being the last purchaser, has the advantage of the bounty. But when there is no bounty, a farmer follows the course of his business, as the nature and circumstance of his lands require. If the times are plentiful, and the prices low; he either sells, or keeps, as bests suits him, and the largeness of the quantity helps to make up for the lowness of price, and plenty is a blessing both to him and the public; should a free liberty of exportation take place, I have no doubt but the price wou'd soon be such as
wou'd

wou'd please him. Thus we see every thing goes on naturally, regularly, and well, without standing in need of the least aid from a bounty, by which means here is a real saving to the nation of from £ 150,000 to £ 300,000 a year; sums much too considerable to be wantonly thrown away; because the measures were thought right once that occasioned them:—but time's so alter'd now, by our extensive improvements, that if they were once necessary, they are now become not only unnecessary, but really very disadvantageous, as will appear clearly by a little further examination into the manner of their operation.

'Twill be readily allowed, when corn sells at a good price, there needs no bounty to procure, or promote exportation: If there is a time then when a bounty is necessary, it must be when corn is so plenty, as not to be vendible at home. An exportation then procured by a further fall of price of five shillings a quarter, amounting to £ 20 per cent.

or near it; is certainly, whether you consider it either in a political, or a commercial view, a measure of a most injurious nature. Suppose the current price of wheat 24s. a foreigner buys at that price, the bounty deducted, it stands him only in 19s. here you make him a present of twenty quarters in every hundred. The temptation to take your wheat on these terms is so great, that the whole country is in a manner exhausted; this is not felt, nor perceived 'till an unfavourable season happens, which has always been found too soon; often in a year or two, which advances the price double, and frequently higher; this at once plunges the nation in distress, and discontent, and impoverishes ourselves, at the same time it enriches our neighbours, who are the purchasers.

Wheat is an article of the most certain demand and consumption, and should a bounty take place again, I wou'd advise every one who is desirous of increasing his fortune, and has £ 100,000,
to

to spare, to lay it all out on wheat, when at a low price; there is not an article in all the world that would so immediately, and so certainly enrich him.

Wheat, upon an average for fifty years back, has been comparatively low; many thanks are due for the great improvements made in that time, otherwise it must have been at an enormous price, whilst under the influence of a bounty; indeed it would have been impossible to have furnished a tenth part of what has been exported, had it not been for such extensive improvements. From this view of things it clearly appears, the farmer stands in need of no aid from a bounty, he is in every sense capable of cultivating his farm, so as to pay his rent, maintain his family, and make ample provision for them. All that seems necessary then is, to give a free and unlimited liberty for exportation, and the corn trade, will require no fur-

ther aid or support. — And I am fully persuaded, should the legislature ever think proper to make the experiment, a bounty on exportation would in a few years be entirely forgot.

The sudden and unexpected advance of wheat in the London market, since writing the above, makes it proper to take notice of the author's conclusion, page 73. of his appendix. He there reflects upon the legislature, for having, against the strongest reasons, urged in favour of exportation, voted away that measure, when wheat was at four shillings a bushel, in compliance with the minister, who urged the discontents of the people. And concludes; "But let the friends of so excellent a measure return with fresh spirit to the charge," &c. The inference which naturally follows this account is, that public advantage, and utility were sacrificed by the minister, to public discontent, that is, to his own popularity. If this author will exercise his great political abilities in giving a solution to the following problems; perhaps it may entirely

irely wipe away the odium, intended to be cast upon the minister, and justify the measure the legislature adopted. He says, during the last sessions, when the question was debated, the price of wheat was proved to be 4s. a bushel, upon an average, throughout the kingdom. Now wheat has been lately sold at £14. a load, or 7s. a bushel, and in good corn countries, and at good markets*. The best wheat has been sold in London, at or near 6s. a bushel. If agreeably to this author's opinion, the legislature had allowed exportation, and granted a bounty as usual; and that bounty had operated as beneficially, that is, as extensively as he cou'd wish; and that the sum suppose of £300,000. had been paid this year for bounty on wheat; that is, suppose 1,200,000 quarters of wheat had been exported; then let him tell the public, how this wou'd have operated; whether such an export caused by the bounty, wou'd have sunk the price of wheat, from 4s. to 3s. a bushel (as it ought to have done to have been consistent with

* August 14. Wheat sold at Barnstaple last market day at 8s. 6d. a bushel.

the opinion he every where maintains) or whether instead of being now at 6s. in London, and 7s. in many country markets, the price wou'd not have advanced to 8s. or 9s. a bushel, or even higher than that? I believe every candid man, will readily allow, that the latter must inevitably have been the case; and is the highest justification of the ministers measure of discontinuing the bounty, and of the legislatures voting it away.

The next question is, being thus circumstanced, whether any farmer in England, will the next approaching season, sow one acre of wheat the less; because a bounty was not granted the last sessions; or should it be the general opinion, that a bounty will not take place the next sessions; will there be one acre of wheat the less sown the next season on that account. I believe the answer to this question, is full as easy, and clear, as the former; and as that clearly proves the not granting a bounty the last sessions, was a wise, and beneficial measure; so
the

the answer to the latter question as clearly proves the same measure of not granting a bounty, will be as prudent and as beneficial should it take place the next session.

Had a bounty taken place the last session, and in consequence thereof, the quantity before mentioned had been exported, the bounty wou'd have amounted to £ 300,000. If the average price at that time was £ 1. 12s. throughout the kingdom, the price has advanced full 20s. a quarter; so that if the quantity before mentioned had been exported, and supposed not to have advanced the price; but had been permitted to be imported, at the now current price, the loss to the nation in six or eight months, wou'd have been at least one million and a half. But if we allow such an export, wou'd most certainly have advanced the price, to at least eight shillings a bushel; the loss then to the nation, wou'd clearly have amounted to two millions two hundred and twenty

ty thousand pounds. A sum much too considerable to be wantonly thrown away, against the clearest conviction, arising from **REAL MATTERS OF FACT** now actually existing; the truth of which is in the power of every one to satisfy himself of.

I am,

S I R,

Yours, &c.

LONDON,
August 12. 1770.

J. WIMPEY.

A



It seems this gentleman would be thought
a man of great consequence, and such
freedom as I have taken, are not to be
taken from him, men look, who ought
to know, and keep their distance. The
true, this is what did not consider
my late defect was caused by
without regarding whether it flowed from
T H O U G H T S

Upon several interesting Subjects, &c.

Dear S I R,



HE man who has the misfor-
tune of being acquainted with
an author, need never doubt
of having something to exer-
cise his patience.

You may remember, I sometime since
read a certain pamphlet to oblige you,
which I freely gave you my thoughts of

B

in

in print ; this, I find, has roused the author's resentment, and produced an appendix, which he calls (tho' I think very improperly) an answer to mine ; a reply it is, and a scurvy one too ; but an answer I am sure it is not.

It seems this gentleman wou'd be thought a man of great consequence, and such freedoms as I have taken, are not to be born from little, mean folks, who ought to know, and keep their distance. 'Tis true, this is what I did not consider, my sole object was the cause of truth, without regarding whether it flowed from the pen of the 'squire, or his ploughman ; or if the writer wore a canvass frock, or a leather jacket. The man and his condition I had no concern with, 'twas the author, and his waking dreams was my object. I own I am a perfect stranger to the two former, and that I never conceived his pretensions to greatness was such, as to afford him hope of protection, thro' the mazes of falsehood, and nonsense. Greatness, and meanness are comparative terms, Sir, and whither this great man's
scale

scale or mine kicks the beam, is a matter of no concern to me; I am under no apprehensions for the fate of my arguments on that score. If the merit of the performance is to be estimated by the high, or low rank of the author; I am afraid neither his, nor mine, will stand in a very desirable point of view.

To be sure, whatever favours of low life, must give offence, and be despised by such exalted greatness; 'tis a matter of great condescension to stoop so low, as to take notice of such a flimsy performance; but that unwary persons may not be deceived, in his great goodness, this man of candour, wisdom and veracity, kindly deigns to be your guide. But, pray, Sir, let me ask this great genius, that looks down with such ineffable contempt, if a flimsy lining, is not good enough for a flimsy woolsey garb? Is not a flimsy answer, sufficient for a flimsy pamphlet? Can any thing be more flimsy, than a performance, which is entirely destitute of sense and truth? But the poor man raves, till he foams in the stile of billingsgate;

doing that by inclination, which he says, he is not bound to do from example. So much for high and low life, and the author's visionary effects of them; and as to the scurrilous terms of assurance, self-sufficiency, &c. &c. So much complained off; I am greatly mistaken, if the passages that occasioned them, will not fully justify their use and application.

But says the author, "previous to the refutation of the arguments in *The Thoughts*, I shall just observe, that not a syllable advanced in that pamphlet is the author's own: all is the transcript of 20 other publications: which Mr. Wimpey has had the modesty to retail as the production of his own brain; I shall not therefore stick so closely to his work, as to the general arguments of John, Thomas, and Harry, as well as Joseph. For they belong equally to 20 owners as to the aforesaid Joseph Wimpey, &c."

The author here pays me a compliment he did not intend, nor did I expect: it at least

least contains a tacit acknowledgement, that the arguments has some merit, or why is he so sollicitous to wrest them from me, and give them to 20 other people. Now, Sir, shall I crave your assistance, to answer this without giving this great author in high life offence: If a man of mean condition, had said this, 'twould certainly have been a barefaced, deliberate, wilful l—e. What pity 'tis, we have not a word in our language, to distinguish the wilful mistakes of the great, from those in low life; an idea of greatness, conveyed at the same time as the want of truth, might soften, if not extenuate the accusation; but something whispers me, such a word would be unnecessary; because greatness and want of truth are incompatible: and whoever descends so low, as to endeavour to serve his cause at the wilful expence of truth, must necessarily be a mean, a base, a low lived being. The author confidently asserts, that not a syllable advanced is my own; but the transcript of 20 other publications. I as confidently aver, that every syllable of it is my own, (which possibly may

may be no advantage, either to me, or to it, but truth is truth,) and that not a syllable of the whole, was transcribed, either from any one, or 20 other publications; the quotations from the expediency excepted. Nor have I for some years, to the best of my knowledge or belief, read any book on the subject, till the expediency was put into my hands. In this I think I have a right to be credited, till my accuser, has produced one at least of the 20 publications he mentions; then I promise to submit to such treatment as I think he deserves, till he has made good his allegations.

'Tis true I have many acquaintance, who have been a great many years in the corn trade, and I have now the satisfaction of knowing that their sentiments exactly concur with mine on the subject; which however I did not know, till they had read my pamphlet: so that when he has answered Joseph, he will have answered, not only John, Thomas, and Harry; but as many as have yet read it,

it, so far as I have hitherto heard, himself only excepted.

"The two general heads, (says our author) under which the debate in question is to be arranged, are, **FIRST**, the price of corn before, and since the bounty, particularly whether it is risen or fallen since;" (I must beg leave, to add, and more particularly what may have been the true cause of such alteration; for that is the interesting question) "and, **Secondly**, the propriety of resting in a free exportation without a bounty."

The author proceeds by a sort of accusation brought against me, for want of candour, &c. in my quotations. I am sure, according to the best of my knowledge, I have carefully avoided giving the least reason for any such remark. Both books are now in the hands of the public, to them I submit, whether I have deserved this accusation, or not. I am at present conscious I have not, and I wish it may hereafter appear, he has used the same candour and fairness in respect to me.

me. In his expediency, p. 6. he gives us a little table, which he tells us shews the gradation of the prices of wheat at Wind-
for for 169 years. That is, from 1594 to 1762. for fear of any misrepresentation I will transcribe the same.

	Years	l.	s.	d.	l.	s.
" From 1594 to 1612	19	2	2	5	} 69 years	2 8
1613 to 1637	25	2	7	4		
1638 to 1662	25	2	15	8		
1663 to 1687	25	2	5	3	} 75	2 2
1688 to 1712	25	2	8	15		
1713 to 1737	25	2	0	7		
1738 to 1762	25	1	18	2		

He says " this little table shews the real
" state of prices, and proves upon the whole
" that the bounty on the exportation (which
" began in 1688) has caused a regular de-
" cline of price."

Now Sir, please to compare this trans-
cript, with the quotation complained of
and tell me if there is the least foundation
for such complaint; if it is not a mere
trick of authorism, to envelop in clouds
and darkness, what will not bear the light,
does he not professedly give us the table
to shew the real state of prices? and does
he

he not with his eye full upon the table,
 aver it proves upon the whole, that the
 bounty on the exportation has caused a
 regular decline of price? and does he not
 in the most impudent manner still de-
 fend the most notoriously false assertion?
 For God sake has he no ideas affixed to
 his words and figures! does his table, or
 does it not shew, that from 1663 to
 1687, the 25 years preceeding the bounty;
 the average price was 2*l.* 5*s.* 3*d.* does it,
 or does it not shew, that from 1688 to
 1712, the average price was 2*l.* 8*s.* 5*d.*?
 does it, or does it not shew, the price was
 3*s.* 2*d.* per quarter lower the 25 years
 preceeding the bounty, than 'twas the
 25 years following the bounty? The man
 that will deny this, would surely deny
 his own existence to answer his purpose;
 yet it is denied, and still persisted in by
 the author. Now, Sir, I think I see
 you smile, and remark the little table
 was provided at the author's trouble, and
 expence, and meant to serve his own
 purpose only; and then you ask "if 'twas
 not ill natured to apply it to a use so contrary
 to its intended purpose." But pray don't
 laugh;

laugh; such mean little people must not take liberties with such great author's, who you see can dispense with honour, truth, and any thing at their pleasure. Every man is liable to error, and all fall into it too often; when 'tis involuntary all have a right to a ready pardon, but the man who knowingly, and willfully sets up falsehood against truth, is unworthy society, and deserves a name and punishment I choose not to mention.

“ But to do the answerer justice, (says the author) he is the mere transcriber of this argument, which was before advanced, and answered in my expediency, p. 7. the passage following that quoted by the answerer, beginning, “ but it is asserted,” will sufficiently prove “ this.” This, Sir, is another absolute mistake: In pages seven and eight, he seems to be answering two books I never saw; which was the reason I took no notice of what these two pages contained; for surely 'twould have been both imprudent, and unfair, for me to have inter-

ferred

ferred concerning the subject of two books, the contents of which, I was, and am still perfectly unacquainted with; further than what this author says about them. But he goes on, "The circumstance of a duty being first laid on importation in the 25 years before the bounty, which with two succeeding ones, amounting almost to a prohibition, is totally overlooked by this writer. Such a prohibition could not fail of acting upon the same principles as a bounty; that is, in lowering the price of corn; and the fact is precisely so, for in that twenty-five years, corn is 10s. 5d. per quarter cheaper than in the twenty-five preceeding."

My reason for taking no notice of this wonderful observation, I have given above; but I did not overlook it as he supposes; I thought then, and do still, 'tis one of the grossest absurdities that ever entered the mind of man; equal at least to any one either in the expediency, or appendix. What a misfortune 'tis, this prodigious politician, had not been at the head of ad-

ministration, when the bounty first took place. How many millions might have been saved to this nation, had this salutary measure been then adopted? seeing as he says "it cou'd not fail of acting upon the same principles as a bounty in lowering the price of corn, and the fact being precisely so."

But pray, have not those heavy duties or customs on importation, been continued ever since, when a bounty had been given? If they cou'd not fail to act on the same principles, as a bounty in lowering the price of corn; and that this was the effective means, of reducing corn in that period 10s. 5d. a quarter the fact being precisely so as this author asserts; pray let him tell us of what use is the bounty: If high duties on importation being next to a prohibition, had all the advantageous effects of a bounty to what purpose has the nation given from £ 150,000 to £ 300,000, a year to promote exportation; when a measure equally efficacious to the same purposes, subsisted at the same time; and without

without the least expence to the nation. But to do this gentleman justice, I must tell you, he is the mere transcriber of this notion from a letter of E. S. a very sensible writer, whose notion he blindly adopted; but wanting his candour and good sense, boldly says, (as if 'twas a self-evident truth) "such a prohibition cou'd not fail of acting upon the same principles as a bounty; that is, in the lowering the price of corn, &c." but never once attempts to give the least reason, how such a measure, cou'd produce such an effect; but says, the fact is precisely so, for the price in that period was lower by 10s. than before.

But he seems to have no knack at distinguishing effects from their causes. The case was plainly this, during the period commencing 1638 and ending 1662, this nation groaned under the calamities and miseries of a civil war; which is always attended with want and distress; this of course opened our ports, and welcomed the vessels that relieved our wants. In
the

the next period when peace was restored, and things went on in their usual channel, and the price of corn was greatly upon the decline, 'twas thought expedient to lay a duty on our imports, to prevent the price at home from falling too low: this measure being adopted by the legislature, by way of encouragement to the farmer to keep up the price to a reasonable height at least; and not to lower it, as is said to have been the effect of that measure. Thus we see, the duties were occasioned by the previous fall of prices, and not the fall of prices the effect of the duties; this Sir, is as plain as the sun at mid-day; but I don't expect to convince the author, at least, that he'll acknowledge it.

But there is a recent instance, that may serve to determine this point. I think sometime in December, or January last, the low duties on the importation of oats expired; the price of oats before that time was low, I believe from 9s. to 12s. per quarter; the dealers in, and consumers of, that grain, expected to have
got

got the low duties continued ; but failing in this, the price immediately advanced from 13 or 14s. to 17 or 18s. and has continued nearly so ever since : now here you see high duties, occasions high prices ; and ever will do so, when importation is in any sense necessary. This is one only, but an hundred instances might be produced, which has invariably had the same effect. Ask any man of sense and experience, if the opening the ports for the importation of oats, or any other grain, on payment of a small duty, does not constantly lower the price ; and if a high duty, and prohibition, does not as constantly advance the price, and if it has not ever operated in this manner. That a prohibition, cou'd not fail of acting upon the same principles as a bounty, at least cou'd not fail of producing the same effect is as certainly true, as his application of it is false ; that is, that either were or ever can possibly be the means of lowering the price of corn, the natural tendency of both is the advancing the price, and the effects of either, will ever shew it to be so.

Now

Now for a stroke of candour and ingenuity. "But (says our author) the remainder of the table is sufficient to shew the fall of price," leaving out the low prices in the period preceeding the bounty, and quoting the three following periods, those making for his purpose; then leaving out the four following years, when, according to his own account, the average price was at 2*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* an advance of 9*s.* 4*d.* per quarter, above the last period. Now if he would make a second appeal "to the common sense of every reader" it must be, if this is not an evident rise of price. But this is such vile prevarication, and such a palpable abuse of the readers time, patience and understanding as is shameful.

To have an argument with a man of candour and integrity, whose sole aim is the cause of truth, is pleasant and may be improving; but with a man totally destitute of veracity, who thinks himself at liberty to say, and unsay, as best suits his purpose, and make you do the same,

same, is one of the most tedious, and disagreeable tasks that can be.

Thus, Sir, am I circumstanced at present, the remainder of the appendix consists almost entirely of studied misrepresentation, sophistry, and falsehood; and little more is necessary for answer, than to desire the candid reader, to compare carefully, the expediency, with my answer thereto; the disingenuity of the the author is in most places sufficiently conspicuous, notwithstanding he has used all his art to cover it in the thick mists of obscurity. Had his pursuit been the cause of truth, and usefulness, a very few pages would have been sufficient to have ended this dispute; but a book maker has other views, he greedily seizes every opportunity of expatiation, and with pleasure tacks six pence to a shilling, without the least regard to the intrinsic value of the commodity, or the interest of the purchaser; was it not for this consideration, I wou'd rest the matter here; but I conceive this wou'd leave a field open for fresh imposition on the public; I must

D.

th ere.

therefore, tho' contrary to my inclination, follow the author through some of his crooked, deceitful windings; but I will endeavour it shall be in the shortest, and most concise manner possible; referring only to the pages of his appendix, without transcribing more, than is absolutely necessary.

In p. 47. he says corn since the bounty has been cheaper; he makes me say that is not true: In answer to which, to make short work, I say that is *false*, for proof I refer him to p. 36, where I say the prices for fifty years back, have been lower than before, I have assigned the cause, and have no where said the contrary. He well knows, the words he quotes, were in answer to the false conclusion, he wittingly drew from his little table, viz. that the bounty on the exportation has caused a regular decline of price. This is another instance of his want of truth and honour, Pages 48, 49, 50 and 51. contain nothing but quibbling, false reasoning, and ridiculous assertions; supposed necessarily to arise from my observations, on his
fal-

fallacious reasonings, upon the fall of price at home in proportion to the quantity sent abroad. If mine was a *merry* question, as he wittily calls it, his I think is a very *sad* answer to it.

The case was plainly this, when stript of the confusion he has thrown about it, in order to render it obscure and difficult. The author had shewn, that in the years 46, 48, 49 and 50. the greatest quantities had been exported ever known, and says that the prices fell, in proportion to the quantities exported. Professedly, and intentionally assigning the largeness of the exports, as, and for the efficient cause of the fall of price. In answer to this I ask'd, If this is not taking the cause for the effect, &c. and plainly proved, that plenty was the true and only source of low prices; upon which exportation depended. So that we see low prices are not obtained by exportation; but that both low prices, and exportation result from the same cause; but, in order of time, low prices first take place, and exportation follows, therefore

cannot be the cause of, but is caused by the lowness of price. If exportation was the cause, and low prices the effect, as the author maintains, corn, nor any thing else, need ever be high priced; you would have nothing to do, but export largely, and that would not only keep down, but would also still fall the price. Our author says *in the year 1750, the exportation was the highest ever known, yet the price very low, even at 1l. 12s. 6d.* At Lady Day 51 wheat was still lower than at Michaelmas 50, but at Michaelmas 51 the price got up to 5s. 6d. per bushel, which in six months was an advance of 1s. 4d. $\frac{1}{2}$ per bushel; now if the price of corn falls, in proportion to the quantity sent abroad, as this wise author asserts; the advance of 1s. 4d. $\frac{1}{2}$ per bushel in six months, must have been owing to the people concerned in that trade, neglecting to export as large quantities then, as they did the year before; and the same evil it should seem, arose from the same cause the following years, and indeed at all times, for why should not the same cause produce the same effect. If I understand

the

the author, these are consequences fairly drawn from the doctrine he maintains; if so here's a catholicon, an universal remedy at hand for all your evils. A sure rule for ease and happiness, so far as they depend on plenty, and cheapness of provisions, &c. Wou'd you wish to have corn, beef, mutton, pork, butter, cheese, &c. &c. cheap; you have nothing to do but to give a bounty sufficient to cause a large exportation of these commodities, and indeed all others according to him; "where is the real politician that will assert your making it the dearer," p. 25. expediency. So that you see, Sir, improvements in agriculture, and favourable seasons are out of the question; these were the same before the bounty took place, yet produced not this effect: the true cause of cheapness is the bounty, and the exportation occasioned thereby; this is evident; for in the years 46, 48, 49 and 50, the exportation ran the highest ever known; there we must surely look for the effect, where we find the price falls at home, in proportion to the quantity sent abroad, this

this is fairly and truly the author's argument.

How perverse then is man, to suffer corn to rise for years together, with an infallible remedy in his power? and the government too, to countenance such a measure, yea even to proceed to a prohibition to exportation, which continues to this day, thereby keeping up the prices at home, which, upon a liberty to export, wou'd certainly fall in proportion to the quantity exported! probatum est. But I wou'd advise this clear sighted genius to have a little patience; I hope the parliament next sessions will take off the prohibition; that wou'd clearly shew how a liberty of exportation, wou'd operate without a bounty. Certainly in proportion to the quantities sent abroad, but not by a fall of price, but by an advance of price, diametrically opposite to the dreams of this great man.

But the author says what I remarked here, " is mere quibbling on words. The
" letter and spirit of my argument were
" plainly

“plainly this. — Very high prices are
 “solely owing to short crops, and never
 “to the exportation.” Here the author
 seems to have forgot ; or is ashamed of
 his own argument. The letter, spirit,
 and plain obvious meaning of his pam-
 phlet is to prove, that low prices are
 solely owing to, and produced by a bounty;
 and particularly so in the years he quoted ;
 and every where blames a discontinuance
 of the bounty, as if that alone must inevi-
 tably raise the price ; this Sir, is the letter
 and spirit of his argument. Pray by a
 period don’t he mean twenty-five years?
 if not, what does he mean ? and if he
 does mean twenty-five years, where does
 the answerer speak of the bounty in
 one period, raising prices in ensuing ones,
 p. 50, I wonder he is not ashamed to forge
 such falshood, and make me the author
 of it, and then set about a tedious refuta-
 tion, of what no soul ever thought of
 but himself ; this is another proof of his
 candour and veracity.—If this respects any
 thing I have said, instead of a period of
 twenty-five years, the time I mentioned is
 the

the first unkind season that follows. See my thoughts, p. 18.

'Tis to me the most amazing thing upon earth, that any man, who pretends to a capacity of thinking, can hesitate a moment, whether an advance of price, is not the unavoidable consequence of a bounty; and more especially when the price of corn is low; for the lower the price, the greater the evil; this may at first sight seem a paradox; but 'tis almost as clear, and certain, as any self-evident truth: For example, let us suppose wheat at 25s. per quarter, the bounty then on exportation amounts to twenty per cent; now, Sir, you are largely in the mercantile way, let me ask you, is there an article in all the whole circle of commerce, that affords the same temptation, for a neighbouring nation to engross. I am fully persuaded, did our neighbours, or their agents know how to come at it, at those low prices, they wou'd not leave a bushel in England if they cou'd help it; for the twenty-five shillings is supposed to be the current price, a quantity must be bought up

up with circumspection, or the price wou'd immediately advance. I know 'tis not possible to ingross the whole: let us suppose one part in twenty only is exported, and a bad season ensues, no power or device upon earth, cou'd prevent its getting up to double the price at least. When the price is between forty and fifty, the temptation to speculation then ceases; for the bounty which before amounted to twenty per cent. at those prices falls to ten or little more; and the price above medium; from hence it clearly appears, when the bounty should be most useful to the farmer, &c. 'tis attended with the most dangerous consequences to the community. When the demand arises from want for immediate use, the bounty then can answer no good purpose; for whether there be any bounty or not, people will have what they want, as long as they can find money to buy it; this is evident, from large quantities of corn having been exported, when the price was too high to admit of a bounty; so that view it in whatever light you please, the bounty clearly appears, not only to be an unprofitable,

E

but

but an exceeding disadvantageous measure.

We come now, Sir, to pages 51, 52, and 53, in which is exemplified a new species of sophistry and deceit; the most impudent and daring, one can conceive. The doctrine he maintains, is, that the bounty has caused a regular decline of price: the reason he assigns is the fall of price, since the bounty was granted, and particularly mentions the years 46, 48, 49, and 50, when the greatest quantities were exported, the prices low, and still declining. To this I answered, that favourable seasons, had occasioned plenty, which was the parent both of low prices, and such large quantities being exported; that the bounty had done mischief, in causing greater quantities to be sent abroad, than was consistent with the good of the nation; which appeared the first unfavourable year, that happened. That in fifty-one, the price advanced, and continued to do so; 'till in fifty-seven, the price was advanced from 4*d.* 1*s.* to 7*s.* 6*d.* nearly double; this is a true state of the argument, and, I believe, sufficiently clear tho' short. But to involve this in perplexity, and impose upon the

the readers understanding, he forges a new table of prices, it existing no where in the universe besides, in which this very honest, candid fair reasoner, falls the prices from 7s. 6d. to 5s. 10d. per bushel, which is only 13s. 4d. per quarter, in order to accommodate it to the use of his own argument. 'Twas convenient for him to shew a fall of price at that time, to invalidate my argument; he therefore has constructed a table of his own, in opposition to the Windsor table; which is universally referred to as the only genuine standard of prices, and on all other occasions used by himself. But on this occasion his sagacity has found out, that the "use of that table is only to shew proportions, between one period and another;" so that, when by that table, wheat is said in any year to be at eight shillings per bushel, and in any other at four shillings, the real prices might have been 16s. and 8s. or 4s. and 2s. for one shews the proportion, as exactly as the other; but when "you speak of the prices of wheat" (says he) "relative to the state and condition of the poor at certain periods, such prices

"are then useless; to talk from them
 "of a *sad reverse*, is absolutely childish."
 There's a sample of honesty and ingenui-
 ty! whether is this, more childish, or more
 knavish? but why all this trouble? How
 does he know that the prices from 1738
 to 62, as quoted by himself, are low prices?
 Is it not from comparing them with the
 prices of former periods as they stand in
 the Windsor table? let him reduce them
 by the same standard, and then let us see
 what the conjuror's argument has got by
 the fallacious metamorphosis; the pro-
 portion will be exactly the same, not only
 in respect to one period and another, but
 also in respect to the condition of the
 poor. His wit here seems also to be as
 ill placed as the rest; which will appear
 clearly, if he'll answer fairly the following
 questions, viz. If the very best wheat at
 Windsor, is not full as profitable to the
 consumer, as wheat of an inferior quality at
 an inferior price; and in the next place,
 if 'twou'd be any alleviation to a poor
 man's concern or misery, who gives 7s.
 or 8s. for a bushel of wheat in any part
 of England, to tell him he has no right
 to

to com
 nine g
 to Ma
 a bush
 prices
 dard
 condit
 are su
 indeed
 moder
 'tis hig
 in Lon
 4s. to
 since i
 places
 but a
 wheat
 the pr
 see m
 hardst
 prices
 bount
 when
 dom
 staple
 near e

to complain of the high price, for he has nine gallons for his bushel ; and if he'll go to Mark Lane, or Bear Key, he may buy a bushel cheaper. But his making the prices in London, a more proper standard of comparison, with respect to the condition of the poor, than the markets they are supplied from, shews great ignorance indeed ; for wheat at London is frequently moderate, when in many parts of England 'tis high. As for example, the current price in London for months past, has been from 4s. to 4s. 6d ; at Barnstaple about a month since it sold for 6s. 9d ; and at some other places in Devonshire, at 6s. 4d. and 6s. 6d. but a vessel arriving at Barnstaple with wheat ; and another at Exeter with flour, the prices are now fallen to 6s. therefore you see no judgment can be formed of the hardships of the poor from the London prices. But it serves to shew, when a bounty takes place, much may be exported, when the poor in many parts of the kingdom may be starving. A bushel at Barnstaple is nine gallons, at some other places near eight gallons and a half.

“ I

"I repeat again," p. 53. Indeed all that you have repeated, and all you have said, can serve no other purpose but to mislead the reader, "just ideas of so momentous a point" are not to be had from your writings, which in every page so wickedly falsify and misrepresent the whole argument.

I come now to p. 54, and cannot help expressing my concern, at finding a man so abandoned; I can scarcely go on six lines in any part, without finding a most palpable blunder, or a wilful and studied falsehood and misrepresentation; he says, "having thus endeavoured further to elucidate the real prices of corn, and shewed that they have ever been low at home in proportion to the *bounty* granted on exportation;" here Sir, I must observe, that the bounty granted has been invariably the same, whenever there has been one, as far as ever I heard; therefore if the prices at home, have ever been low, in proportion to the bounty; the bounty having been always the same, the prices must

must
an i
auth
mist
make
tion,
goes
" se
" th
" bu
" in
now
in w
that
cou'd
mean
such
then
is re
" if
" ch
" w
" im
" ag
" ad
" tle
" al

must have been so too. But this is not an involuntary blunder, but one of the author's fallacious engines, to raise a mist before the readers eyes, in order to make me the author of a ridiculous assertion, which never had existence. He goes on, " I should next reply to the assertion, that this falling of price is the *cause* of the BOUNTY, not the *effect*; but that sophistry is sufficiently refuted in another place." Great, candid Sir, now pray be so good as to tell your reader, in what part of my pamphlet you find that foolish assertion, or any thing that cou'd give a possible rise to it. Is it not mean, and base below description, to forge such an assertion, father it upon me, and then tell your readers the sophistry of it is refuted in another place. He goes on; " if the *bounty* is but the *effect* of the cheapness; pray what is the *cause*? why, says this writer, p. 36. " The great improvements that have been made in agriculture. Now all this has been advanced by half a score of these gentlemen at least; I have given a reply already." Now what must I say to this?
the

the question is his own, never put before;
 “ If the *bounty* is but the *effect* of the *cheap-*
ness ; pray what is the *cause* ? ” To this
 he makes me answer, *the great improve-*
ments that have been made in agricul-
ture. If he meant to ask the cause of
 cheapness, that question has been fully
 answered already, and stands thus. Fa-
 vourable seasons causes plenty, plenty cheap-
 ness ; cheapness, aided by a bounty, car-
 ries exportation to an unnatural length,
 that exhausts your stock at home, and the
 first unfavourable year that happens, corn
 rises to an exorbitant price. ’Tis not the
 want of discernment, but the want of ho-
 nesty, that makes him talk so nonsensi-
 cally, as to ask the cause of the *bounty* ;
 when, in the sentence immediately before,
 he says, if it is but the effect of cheapness ;
 that is, in plain English : If *cheapness* is the
cause of the *bounty* ; then pray what is
 the *cause* of the *bounty* ? but the whole
 design is only to mislead the reader by a
 false use of the word bounty. Who the
 half score gentlemen are, and what is his
 dispute with them, I am an absolute stran-
 ger to ; but this I know, if he has treated
 them

them
 and v
 pity
 ink, a
 fessio
 pardo
 to im
 and

Bu
 “ me
 “ be
 “ wo
 “ occ
 “ lar
 “ wo

He
 fible
 has
 year
 past,
 there
 “ we
 “ the
 and
 tried.

them with the same degree of insincerity, and want of honour he has me ; 'tis great pity he should ever have the use of pen, ink, and paper, but upon condition of confession, public recantation, and begging pardon of his reader, promising never to impose upon them again by falsehood and misrepresentation.

But he goes on, " all these improvements were known and practised long before the bounty ; why did they not work their effects before ? the bounty occasioned a sure market, and a regularity of price, which set improvers to work."

Here again I must appeal to the sensible reader, and ask, if no improvement has been made in agriculture since the year 1688, that is, in eighty-two years last past, this man of candour and truth, says there has not ; " all these improvements were known and practised long before the bounty." Out of thy own mouth, and by thy own words shall thou be tried. The reader is desired to turn to

pages 14 and 15. of his expediency, where he will find, "great quantities of beef
 " arise from two sources, summer grazing
 " on rich, meadow and pasture, and win-
 " ter grazing on turnips, &c. " That
 " the corn trade have occasioned very
 " extensive tracts of waste lands to be in-
 " closed and cultivated ;" " that the corn
 " laws have brought into culture more
 " waste acres in Norfolk alone, than are
 " sufficient to answer the whole expor-
 " tation of Britain ; and yet those acres
 " have furnished Smithfield with a quan-
 " tity of mutton, and beef, proportioned to
 " that of their corn." " That these lands are
 " occupied four or five years by turnips,
 " and clover, and rye grafs out of six or
 " seven;" " their flocks of sheep are conse-
 " quently great, and the quantity of turnip,
 " fed beef sent to market, every salesman
 " in Smithfield will testify ; hence we
 " find, that the bounty encouraging the
 " growth of corn, is not an encroachment
 " upon grasses, or on the other food of
 " cattle, but actually increases both in an
 " immense degree."

Now

Now
 this w
 account
 provem
 when d
 took p
 indebte
 as a bo
 (tho' h
 because
 anteced
 will no
 he flat
 he say
 " know
 " bound
 this I r
 ters, pa
 improv
 that ha
 one sh
 shilling
 countr
 " regit
 " past
 " play

Now I must desire the reader will ask this wiseacre: If the above mentioned accounts, are not accounts of so many improvements in agriculture? if they are, when did this commence? since the bounty took place, to which he says they are indebted; or before there was such a thing as a bounty; he will hardly say before, (tho' he has said things full as monstrous;) because, that wou'd be making the effect antecedent to the cause; if he says since, will not that be plainly affirming, what he flatly denies in appendix, p. 54. where he says "all these improvements were known and practised long before the bounty." For his own account of this I refer you again to his farmers letters, pages 7 and 8. he says he has known improvements carried to such perfection that he has known land advanced from one shilling rent to eight, nine and ten shillings, and that over a large extent of country. Again, see p. 304. "If an exact register had been kept for a century past of any tract of land or farms, displaying the produce of every kind, we

F 2

" should

“ should find it in an uniform progression
 “ of encrease,” &c. In his expediency
 all these improvements were known and
 practised long before the bounty, why did
 they not work their effects before? but there
 is no end of his self contradictions. As no
 dependance can be had upon his answers,
 he affirming or denying, not as truth re-
 quires, but as best suits his own purpose ;
 I will appeal to the reader, whither the
 extensive use of turnips, clover and rye
 grass, sainfoin, lucerne, the field culture
 of potatoes, carrots and cabbages, hand
 hoeing beans, peas, &c. the use of the
 horse hoe, divers sorts of manures, a deep-
 er, better, and more frequent plowing and
 stirring the land, are not all of a mo-
 dern date ; long since a bounty took place;
 even if a great progress have not been
 made in the use of some of these within
 a very few years. The whole world will
 acknowledge this, tho’ he has the assu-
 rance to deny it. The cultivation of the
 potatoe is so extensive, that some people
 think, that root alone is a means of keeping
 down wheat in dear times, at least from
 4*d.* to 6*d.* per bushel; it being at such times
 used

used en
 among
 Lancas
 all tim
 county

Tun
 never
 lately,
 land; a
 day ;
 as Dor
 vonshi
 ed, an
 to pre
 the ex
 recent
 and h
 the lan
 ceeding
 to the
 says, “
 “ ket,
 “ imp
 please
 though
 the fa

used entirely to supply the place of bread, among the poor in the counties of Cheshire, Lancashire, part of Somersetshire, and at all times great use is made of it in every county of England.

Turnips have been long in use, but never cultivated to the best advantage till lately, at least not in many parts of England; and in some they are not hoed to this day; westward the practice is got as far as Dorsetshire; but in most parts of Devonshire, the thing has never been attempted, and no arguments have been sufficient to prevail upon the farmers there to make the experiment; this serves to shew how recent this improvement must have been; and how all these improve and fertilize the land; and how much larger the succeeding crops of corn must be, I submit to the candid readers judgment. But he says, "the bounty occasioned a sure market, and a regularity of price, which set improvers to work." If the reader will please to turn to pages 25 and 26, of my thoughts, he will find I have clearly proved the falsehood of this assertion; and that
the

the prices have been more irregular, and distant since the bounty, than they ever were before. To what purpose then did it set improvers to work, since 'twas all known and practised before without effect. Let him remember we are now speaking of the fact; whether there has, or has not been any improvement made since the bounty took place; this is necessary to remark, or by and by we shall have the cause and effect blended again.

I have now gone thro' with his first general head; in which I think I have clearly proved, there is not a single sentence respecting the argument, but contains some error, blunder, prevarication, wilful misrepresentation, or falsehood: I am now therefore on the point of deliberation, whether I shall drop this hero in deceit, in his bewildered circle of fallacious disputation; requesting the reader to compare his following pages, with the account it refers to in my pamphlet, he will find the same vein of candour, honesty and truth go through the whole; and what I have
said

said m
thro' t
mazes

Yor
ferenc
return
ing th
ings o
what
" seco
" a f
" any
" on
" but
" fib
" exa
cribe
his p
and
conc
" a f
" ta
" in
" th
" ve
" an

said may serve as a clew to lead him thro' the fogs and mists of the deceitful mazes.

* * * * *

You, Sir, I find think otherwise, in deference then to your judgment, I will return to the disagreeable task of clearing the remainder from the deceitful daubings of the author. We come now to what he calls (pages 54 and 55.) "the second general head; the opinion *that* "a free exportation is sufficient without any bounty. What the answerer says "on this head deserves very little note; "but men of different abilities may possibly think the same; let us therefore "examine the question." He then transcribes as much as he thinks may serve his purpose from my thoughts, pages 11 and 18, and then draws this very unjust conclusion, "In the first passage, giving "a free and unlimited liberty for exportation is an excellent measure — but "in the second, *mark the event*; says he, "the tables are turned, and the case is "very different; *scarcity* will come, distress "and famine will stare your people in the

"the face." He then exults as if he had gained a victory: "what ridiculous trifling is this in a man who pretends to prove another's facts to be all false, and his reasoning wholly erroneous."

To relieve the reader from the gross imposition, that is intended to be passed on his understanding by the author; I must desire him, after reading the transcript from p. 11. "Give a free and unlimited liberty for exportation, and it will flourish and prosper, as far as is reasonable, and fit it should." That in his way to p. 18, he will read p. 17; to which the sense of the passage transcribed by the author is necessarily connected, and the declared use of what he quotes, was to explain, and set in a clear light, what passed in the preceeding page; which this candid gentleman now chuses to pass over in silence, that the trick may pass.—In order to give you a clear idea of this matter, I must beg leave to state the argument, as short as I can from p. 17. where I observe, the author maintains the bounty on the exportation caused a regular decline

cline of price; this I denied, and shewed from his own account, that the price was 3s. 2d. higher the twenty-five years after the bounty took place, than 'twas the twenty-five years preceeding the bounty. He next asks, "If exportation and the bounty raised the price, when both ran at the highest ever known, we must surely look for its effect;" this is very oddly exprest, but his meaning is plain from what follows, that the price falls at home, in proportion to the quantity sent abroad; and to prove this, quotes four years, wherein the quantities sent abroad was as great as ever known; yet the price low and declining. To this I answer, this is taking the cause for the effect, and the effect for the cause, plainly meaning, as is clearly exprest in the following, page 19, which is a part of the same answer; that a fall of price, cou'd not possibly be owing to, or be produced by, the quantity sent abroad; but that plenty caused low prices, and these were the true sources, or causes of large quantities being sent abroad; and that the quantity sent abroad, was then, and ever will be, in pro-

G

portion

portion to the price at home ; for, unless the prices at home, are naturally lower than our neighbours, or artificially made so (by a bounty, must be understood, or what does artificially relate to) there can be no exportation. Now reader, give me leave to ask, if all this is not on a supposition of a bounty actually existing ; if not, where was the idea of a bounty dropt? where have I said a word against exportation, unless when it depends upon a bounty. Surely a bounty and exportation are not the same thing, as this author wou'd make one believe ; wherein then does the inconsistency of the two transcripts consist? in what sense " are the tables turned, and the case very different?" does not the transcript he himself makes from p. 14. belye his own interpretation? does the export mentioned in either mean without a bounty? don't I every where say, a free liberty to export is a most desirable measure? Don't I every where say a bounty is a pernicious measure? and can it be said, I have any where expressed, or suggested

a syllable to the contrary of either? The man that has impudence enough to say that, is equal to any thing that words can do. This is the man who is not ashamed to complain of ridiculous trifling! But his, Sir, is much worse than ridiculous trifling, it betrays a badness of heart, a total disregard to truth, a crime of an exceeding black dye; for by such transposition of words and letters, he may make any man speak what he pleases, even treason or blasphemy.

To follow this dealer in deceit, sentence by sentence, through his egregious blunders, and wilful misrepresentations, requires more time than I can spare, or have inclination to: I must therefore beg leave to give the amount of what he says in as few words as I can in pages 57, 58, and part of 59. referring the reader thereto, to see I do him justice. His argument then is this. Distress and famine convey no explicit idea when spoken of the prices of British corn; that according to my ideas it does not arrive when wheat is at 6s. a bushel.

He therefore supposes I mean not less than 7s. 6d. to amount to famine; and 5s. the average I wou'd in general wish for. My argument therefore is, he says, the giving from 12l. to 20l. per cent. (that is giving a bounty) raises the price in unfavourable years much higher than 6s. or probably than 7s. and this he says, I say, *is a real matter of fact*. He then refers you to a table of his own constructing, to serve his sinister purposes; and says, there we find, that wheat never arose above 5s. 10d. a price, under the rate, which I wish wheat may never exceed! The mean price, he says, of the whole twenty-five years, so low as 3s. 8d. $\frac{1}{2}$, and but one year in the whole period that exceeds 5s.—(meaning still by his own forged table); and then exults, distress and famine stares us in the face; because the price of wheat has been *lower* than this very modest answerer wishes it to remain at! and says it is amazing to me, &c. An expression of surprize not improperly made by me in page 25, upon detecting him in a most palpable falsehood. But he goes on; we are told

it

it is a real matter of fact, that we buy our own corn again, at £ 100 per cent. advance. "That in the year 1757, we imported 130,343 quarters of wheat; the price of the year" (by his own table) "£ 2. 6s. 8d. Now (he says) for foreigners to have bought that wheat of us to resell it at £ 100 per cent. advance, they must have purchased it in 1745, and laid it by in their granaries twelve years;" and then exults again, "so little does this gentleman enquire into the foundation of his *real matters of fact, &c.*"

I answer this author's ludicrous manner of treating the distresses of the poor is inhumanly absurd. He has given too frequent instances of his maxims, *the higher the price of provisions, the greater the distresses of the people, the more flourishing the nation.* I say this occurs too often in his wonderful writings for any to doubt of his kind disposition; or for him to escape the sharp censure of others.

But

But, Sir, tho' the distresses of the poor are principally owing to the high price of wheat, when it happens to be so; yet the measure of their distress, cannot be estimated by the precise price of that article singly: for their distress may be as great, or greater, when wheat is at 7s. or 7s. 6d. per bushel, than when 'tis at 8s. because other articles of food may be moderate, and those that are proper, and seasonable substitutes to bread may be plenty and cheap. I have said that I take 5s. per bushel to be a medium price; that 4s. wou'd not injure the farmer, nor 6s. be an intolerable hardship on the poor; and, I believe, most people are of the same opinion. But the core of the evil lies here: I maintain, that the drain made by the bounty, raises the price in succeeding unfavourable years; whereas it appears, the exports in the last period was greater than ever known, and yet the price was lower, and that wheat never arose above 5s. 10d: Here, Sir, you'll please to observe, the price is taken from his own table; by which device, this able jugler
in

in fig
made
refer
nuine
and t
I say,
of a b
was
and a
this
of ho
tells
on,
" tha
" pe
" pu
" it
" lit
" th
" fa
he p
stan
ness.
a tal
beca
shev
at

in figures, cou'd as easily, and as truly have made it 2s. 10d. or 3s. 10d. But let us refer to the Windsor table; the only genuine table extant, that I ever heard off, and the table referred to on all occasions: I say, there we shall find, that the price of a bushel of wheat at Michaelmas 1756 was 6s. 9d; at Lady Day 1757, 8s. 6d; and at Michaelmas following 6s. 6d; tho' this gentleman, by his surprizing feats of hocus pocus, reduces it to 5s. 10d. and tells you it never rose above. But he goes on, "now for foreigners to have bought that wheat of us, to resell at £ 100 per cent. advance, they must have purchased it in the year 1745, and laid it in their granaries twelve years. So little do this gentleman enquire into the foundation of his *real matters of fact*," &c. What a virtuous regard he pays to *real matters of fact*, this instance among a multitude shall bear witness. Let us refer to the Windsor table; a table he cannot object to on this occasion; because he allows it to be a just one to shew proportions. There we find that at Lady Day 1755, the price of wheat

was

was 3*s.* 11*d.* $\frac{1}{2}$; at Michaelmas the same year 4*s.* 6*d.*; at Lady Day 1756, at 4*s.* 6*d.* $\frac{1}{2}$; and at Lady Day 1757, 'twas at 8*s.* 6*d.* From hence it clearly appears, beyond the possibility of a mistake, or a doubt that if a foreigner purchased wheat any time from Michaelmas 1754, to Lady Day 1755, and sold it again here any time from Michaelmas 1756, to Lady Day 1757, the exact space of two years, he would have gained more than £ 112 per cent. If he had purchased any time in the year 1755, taking the years price upon an average, and had sold at the end of eighteen months, the advanced price would have been £ 100 per cent.—If he had purchased from Michaelmas 1755 to Lady Day 1756, the advance for keeping twelve months only, would have been £ 85 per cent. and upwards.—Besides, it should be observed, these are average prices of five months; whereas, were the true price of each week to be come at, 'tis very probable some were so much below 3*s.* 11*d.* $\frac{1}{2}$; and others so much above 8*s.* 6*d.* that the real advance from one extreme to the other, might be equal to

to £
it w
that
Lady
quan
expo
the
land,
Day
cent.
porte
shew
neces
grana
cent.
dered
but t
and

H
" fal
" con
" bas
" 2*l.*
" 13*s.*
" (bo
" por

to £ 150 per cent. and 'tis very probable it was so. Besides, it must be considered, that from the low prices of 1755, and Lady Day 1756, we must deduct 5s. per quarter, or 7d. $\frac{1}{2}$ per bushel on the wheat exported in those eighteen months, so that the advance of what was imported in England, from Michaelmas 1756, to Lady Day 1757, was upwards of £ 100 per cent. upon an average on what was exported the preceeding year only : this, Sir, shews the value of his forged table, the necessity of laying up corn twelve years in granaries to advance the price £ 100 per cent. and that this author cannot be considered as a MATTER OF FACT MAN ; but the professed, declared enemy of truth, and *real matters of fact*.

He goes on. " But can there be a greater
 " fallacy, than supposing the price of
 " corn here to rise in proportion to what
 " *has been* sent abroad ? wheat in 1757 is
 " 2l. 6s. 8d. a quarter, and we import
 " 130,000, quarters; in 1756, it is 1l. 15s. 2d. $\frac{1}{2}$;
 " (both by his own table) " and we ex-
 " port 101,936 quarters. Who can think

H

" that

" that the import of 1757 is owing to the
 " export of 1756 ? or that it is within the
 " verge of possibility for the export of
 " 101,936 quarters, to raise the price of
 " wheat 11s. a quarter in one year ! A fail-
 " lure of the crop raised the price, and
 " the effect wou'd have been the same,
 " had none been exported in 1756." I an-
 swer, that the failure of a crop is an un-
 doubted cause of raising the price, is a
 truth, I believe, no one has denyed ; but
 that the advance is increased by a large
 quantity exported the preceeding year,
 is, I believe, deny'd by nobody but him-
 self ; for surely 'tis self-evident, if none
 had been exported in the years 1755
 and 1756, there cou'd have been no oc-
 casion for the importation of 1757, because
 that stock wou'd have been upon hand,
 which 'twas found necessary to import.
 But as he seems ignorant that there wou'd
 have been any difference in the effect,
 I will shew him what the difference was.
 Had we exported less in these two years,
 than we imported in 1757, say 130,000
 quarters, the sum saved to the nation in
 the bounty only wou'd have amounted

to

to £ 32,500; to which we are to add the advance of price upon 28,064 quarters exported in 1755 at 1*l*. 6*s*. per quarter, which amounts to £ 36,483. 4*s*. more: to which we are to add the advance of price upon 101,936 quarters exported in 1756 at 14*s*. 8*d*. per quarter; which, together, amounts to the sum of £ 143,736. 5*s*. 4*d*. and this sum the nation really lost by the exports of a small part of 1755, and 1756, and the import of the same in 1757. N. B. the prices are taken from the Windsor table, the average of 1757 is 7*s*. 6*d*. of 1755 the average is 4*s*. 3*d*. the advance 1*l*. 6*s*. per quarter; the average of 1756, is 5*s*. 8*d*. the advance 14*s*. 8*d*. per quarter. If the loss sustained then in one year is so very great, how immense must it be when in one year ten times, and in others about eight times as much were paid for bounties. And yet this great man of penetration and candour, has the modesty to aver, the effect wou'd have been the same, had none been exported in 1756.

In page 60, he says, "But still it

"is said, *we sell corn to foreigners*, and
 "buy again at from £ 50 to £ 100 per
 "cent. advance. Granting this; pray
 "what objection to it?" &c. Pray ask
 any farmer, or dealer, the same ques-
 tion with respect to himself. Suppose
 wheat at 1*l.* 3*s.* per quarter, the mar-
 ket dull and few buyers, wou'd any man
 give 5*s.* per quarter to a purchaser to take
 it off his hands, and stand a chance of
 giving 40*s.* or 50*s.* per quarter the first
 bad season, perhaps the next year? The
 supposition is monstrous, if made to a pri-
 vate man, and yet recommended to the
 nation. I consider the nation as one
 large family, when compared with other
 nations in respect to trade; and its inte-
 rest should be taken the same care off,
 and conducted on the same principles as
 those of a private family, and then no
 one wou'd think of trading upon prin-
 ciples of loosing from £ 50 to £ 100 per
 cent. without objection. That the grant-
 ing a bounty, when corn is so very low,
 is a most pernicious measure, I think I
 have already clearly and fully proved,
 and also that all I have said, is perfectly
 con-

consistent with a free and unlimited exportation, whether the price be £ 1. 3s. or £ 2. 3s. provided the exportation be natural, and not procured at the unnecessary expence of a bounty. The question he puts, if we should always buy and sell at the same price in that case, is childish; for the selling price must be determined by the demand for the commodity, as in other cases; and the exports not being carried to an unnatural length by a bounty, we shou'd seldom, if ever, be drove to the necessity of buying: but if we were, we should then buy upon equally good terms with our neighbours, and not our own corn again, at the loss of 5s. per quarter, besides the advance of price. Page 61. That there are many other writers, who are much more worthy of attention than I am, who may have asserted the same thing, no man in England is more sensible of, nor more willing to acknowledge; but these gentlemen know better how to employ their time, than in confuting thoughts stolen from others, published with ignorant assurance, and defended by impudence and deceit. The author has charged me more than

than once with transcribing many other peoples works; which I defy him to prove, but I will give him chapter and verse unasked for my charge on him; for I scorn to reflect without reason, or to attempt to impose falsehood upon the reader; who, by turning to the fourth number, page 16, 17, 18, &c. of vol. 6. of that very useful and entertaining work, the *Museum Rusticum & Commerciale*; he will find a letter entitled "Observations on the causes of the present high price of corn; and the expedience of continuing the bounty; in a letter to the editors." This, Sir, is a very sensible, well wrote letter, conceived in terms of respect and decency; and submitted and recommended to the consideration of the public; and I am sorry I did not see it 'till after I had published my thoughts, that I might then have had an opportunity of replying directly to some of the principal arguments it contains. From this letter, Sir, is the author's expediency purloined, which he not very *modestly retails as the production of his own brain*. Had he published it with the same deference to the public the original was,
he

he had escaped the censure he complains of; the charge of assurance and self-sufficiency, &c. wou'd then have been improper and unjust; but for a man of mean abilities, to decide magisterially and dogmatically, on points of much importance to the interest of the nation, and treat every one that happens to differ in opinion from him, with the most sovereign contempt; accusing them of being swayed by motives of interest, or extremely ignorant of the subject, even so much (to use his own expression) that he doubts if they know a hog from a rabbit. —must naturally excite the contempt and resentment of every reader he abuses. This, I apprehend, will wipe away every ground of complaint, seeing he is the aggressor, and is only paid in his own coin; with this difference; he has abused the public without reason; and he is censured only for so doing.

But wou'd you think, Sir, any man in the world, cou'd have the effrontery to charge another, with transcribing other peoples works, without being able to quote a single sentence, when he himself

self perhaps is in this respect the greatest offender now living. His farmers' letters contain whole chapters, amounting to a hundred pages at least, which he has transcribed almost verbatim from the *Museum Rusticum*; * the letters I mean are signed Y, and dated at a place near Bury, in Suffolk. What will you think of a book-maker whose works are composed of materials stolen thus by wholesale.

Can there be a greater imposition in the world than for an author to steal another man's work, a hundred pages together, publish them under another title, and sell them to the world for a new work; perhaps it may be said, he was the author of those letters; if so, I think that an aggravation of the crime. The editor of that work cou'd not have published them without his concurrence; therefore his publishing his own works a second time, under another title, was a gross abuse

* His blunders, or the persons who cloths his thoughts with language excepted; perhaps they may be corrected in the third edition of that *useful* work. See page 355, where he makes a very sensible author say *vis inertia* for *vis unita*, does this great author know the difference; or does he not?

abuse of the editor of that work, as well as of the public; had he stolen from another, there might have been some chance for entertainment, or improvement; but when a man robs the 'spital, he must be an etrant thief indeed.

But to return to the remainder of his arguments, he says, p. 61. "Suppose Amsterdam buys all corn that does not exceed 30s. a quarter. England has much to sell at that price; and her government thinks it expedient to allow exportation. France sells at 29s. 6d. under the same circumstances: of whom will Amsterdam buy? Not a bushel of Britain, but of those who will sell 6d. a quarter cheaper," &c.—A very pretty sensible question, and sensibly answered. But should France sell at 29s. 6d. what hinders Britain from selling at 29s. Pray which is the wisest measure, and most for the interest of Britain, to fall 6d. or 1s. a quarter in the price, or to give a bounty of 5s. a quarter; for by the state of the argument one answers the end as well as the other. But how comes Britain

to have much to sell at that price? Is it not because the quantity on hand is so proportioned to the demand; or the demand to it, as to cause it to be so? The same reason enables France to sell at 29s. 6d: Is it not absurd then for Britain to give a bounty to enable it to rival a neighbouring nation, where at any particular time the price is lower than here. Why, he says, this is necessary in order to force the market: I answer therein the absurdity of the measure consists. The very measure he recommends for Britain to rival and undersell France, (or any other nation, for 'tis the same thing,) cancels and destroys its own purpose, and enables them to rival and undersell it. Let us take the price in both nations at 30s. as before; a merchant in France will never buy wheat at 30s. there, to sell it at 29s. 6d. at Amsterdam, but if he can buy wheat in Britain at 30s. and draw back 5s. for bounty on exportation, he can afford to sell it at that price, and enrich himself at Britain's expence. Therefore that the commerce of corn should be a *trade in Holland*, and that a
mer-

merch
capita
prizin
to ho
that
the u
to £
can d
and e
the m
certai
years.
But
" stat
" bou
" wh
" exp
" dic
land
enfor
that
ing i
more
comm
A gr
ing o
and

merchant there should throw a whole capital into it, cannot be the least surprizing; when Britain puts it in his power to hoard it up upon terms so advantageous, that are annexed to no one article in the universe besides. Terms from £ 10 to £ 20 per cent. below what a native can do, unless he provides granaries abroad and exports it; and this in an article too of the most certain sale, and utmost moral certainty of doubling its price in a few years, if bought at or under 3s. a bushel. But he says, p. 62. "Holland being a
 "state *merely* commercial, requires no
 "bounty to assist such trade; but England,
 "which is the *growing* as well as the
 "exporting country, is in a different predicament:" I answer, 'tis very true, Holland need give no bounty to assist, or enforce their trade; Britain has rendered that measure unnecessary by kindly doing it for them; but why it should be more necessary for a growing, than a commercial country, does not yet appear. A growing country, and a manufacturing one, are in this sense much the same: and surely both can afford to sell its pro-

duce and manufactures as low as any nation which is merely commercial, and must first buy before they can sell; the expence of which, together with their gain, must be paid by the last purchaser; and wou'd more naturally come into the pocket of the grower, or manufacturer, than into the pockets of the subjects of the commercial state, if not diverted by improper measures.—*A free and unlimited liberty is the life of all commerce; and the corn trade like all others, stand in need of no other encouragement; leave the trade to itself, and 'twill flourish without the aid or assistance of any bounty whatever.*

“ Here (says the author, alias the transcriber, page 63.) “ I rest my defence of the bounty, in answer “ to those who deny its expediency.” And here says the answerer, I rest the demolition of that weak, that false defence, desiring to submit the whole to the impartial judgment of the candid reader.

The

The author having finished his defence, might have spared his animadversions; probably from thence he'll derive little more credit than from the other. If what he said of interest he thought foreign to the purpose, why did he introduce it. By interest 'tis plain I mean't legal interest, which he distinguishes from real interest, and has given a table to shew the difference; pray is this like the former, a table of his own constructing, to serve a purpose? But be it what it may, I defy him to shew what is real interest to any degree of precision, when distinguished from the legal. Calculations upon the stocks, or funds, will not do it; nor calculations made on any mode of employment of money. To take in every mode wou'd be too complex and difficult, and nothing certain cou'd be ascertained; but, in my own opinion, about 4*l.* 10*s.* may come near the truth: But be it as 'twill, it has little or no relation to the matter; this I observed at first, and the author now acknowledges it.

In

In pages 65, 66, &c. he endeavours to throw an odium upon me, by an accusation of false quotation; a thing I despise as much as I do every man that makes use of so mean a subterfuge: let us examine the passages, and see if they do not contain the contradiction I charged them with, and whether the *malevolence, stupidity, and misinterpretation* belong to him or me.

In order to give the reader a true idea of this matter, I must beg leave to trouble him with an entire transcript of each passage. In the farmers letters 'tis said, "The unprofitable practice of plowing up pastures, and not laying them down again, which is so universal in this country among farmers, whenever their landlords will allow it, tends perpetually to impoverish them. They are all to a man mad after ploughed lands, and wou'd willingly break up every acre of grass in their farms." In his expediency, the passage which I take to be a flat contradiction to the above, is as fol-

follows. " To talk of farmers ploughing up
 " rich meadow and pasture land, on account
 " of advantages accruing from the cul-
 " ture of corn is so manifest an absurdity,
 " that it shews these writers to be totally
 " ignorant of country business; Such lands
 " lets from 10s. to 30s. an acre more
 " than the arable adjoining— It is a likely
 " matter, that landlords wou'd allow *such*
 " to be ploughed up."

The inferences that naturally present themselves from the first of these passages are plainly the following, viz.

First, That plowing up pastures, and not laying them down again, is an unprofitable practice.

Secondly, That it is universally practised by all the farmers in that country, to a man, when their landlords will allow it.

Thirdly, That their landlords do frequently allow it, or it cou'd with no truth or propriety be said the practice was so universal there.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, That it is a bad practice, and tends to impoverish them.

Fifthly, Notwithstanding their passions, or inclination, for plowing up pastures is very great.

Now before I go on to the second, it may be proper to observe, that the same lands, the same landlords, the same farmers, or tenants, are meant and intended in the second passage, as in the first; and indeed there is not the least reason to suppose otherwise; or if it should be said no particular lands, landlords, or tenants were meant, but that it meant all in general indefinitely, 'tis the same thing.

I come now to the other passage in the expediency, which begins thus, "To talk of farmers ploughing up rich meadow and pasture land, on account of advantages accruing from the culture of corn, is so manifest an absurdity," &c.

I answer the talking of, about, or concern-

ing

ing the ploughing up rich meadow, &c. implies not the least absurdity; that a man may talk absurdly about it, is, I think, true, and very evident that the author has done so; but to talk of it, or about it, implies nothing absurd; therefore the plain and obvious meaning of the author must be. To assert, to think, to suppose that farmers would plow up rich meadow and pasture land, &c. is so manifest an absurdity, that it shews the writers to be totally ignorant of country business. I ask, how does the absurdity of this appear; the answer immediately follows, (because) such lands let from 10s. to 30s. an acre more than the arable adjoining. Now I appeal to all the world if this is not as fair, as candid, and as clear an interpretation on the author's words as 'tis possible to put, and if they are capable of any other meaning whatever; if not, then I appeal again, if the whole of this passage is not altogether as much dependent on the farmer as the former. His meaning must have been exactly the same as if he had said: A man must be totally ignorant of country business

K

who

who could suppose a farmer wou'd be so manifestly absurd, as to plow up rich meadow, and pasture land, on account of advantages accruing from the culture of corn, when such lands let from 10s. to 30s. more than the arable adjoining. Now I defy the author, and all the world to put any other fair and clear construction upon the passage; and then the sentiments must be allowed to be as opposite and self contradictory to the full, as I represented them. What he says, of being dependent on the landlord is downright nonsense, and has nothing to do with the will and inclination of the farmer. — "It is a likely matter" that landlords wou'd allow such to be "ploughed up." What has this to do with the farmers inclination to break up or not break up his pasture land: this indeed may serve to shew, that the landlord sometimes restrains the tenant from breaking up meadow and pasture land; but if the author means to say they always do, as indeed he does in p. 68. this will amount to as palpable a contradiction as the former charge: for,
in

in the first passage, it clearly appears that landlords do frequently permit it. How contemptibly, false, evasive, and mean is it then for a man to say, in the preceding pamphlet, "I said not a syllable of the breaking grass as dependant on farmers, but on landlords; and this so expressly, that nothing but the meanness of false quotation, cou'd have ventured such a piece of effrontory: In the farmer's letters, I say, as expressly that farmers are eager to break up, whenever their landlords will allow it. I desire to know wherein the opposition of these sentiments consists? in one, I say, that landlords will not allow rich pastures to be broken up. In the other I assert, that farmers are ever ready to break up when landlords will allow it:" (that is, farmers are ever ready to break up when landlords will allow; what landlords will not allow; that is, rich pastures to be broken up. Was there ever such stupidity, as for a man to accuse himself of such nonsense). But he goes on, "these are facts and coexisting facts; which nothing but malevolence,

“ or stupidity, cou’d misinterpret.” That what you call coexisting facts is nonsense is very evident ; but the opposition of sentiments, and self contradiction charged upon you, consists in this. In the farmers letters you say, the farmers are all to a man mad to break up their pastures; and if their landlords wou’d suffer it, wou’d break up every acre of grass in their farms (or to this effect). In your expediency you maintain to suppose this is so manifest an absurdity, that wh oever thinks so, must be ignorant of country business. Again, in the former, you allow that landlords do frequently allow pasture lands to be ploughed up ; in the latter you say landlords will not allow them to be broken up. Are these opposite sentiments, or are they not ? or are they the effects of malevolence, stupidity, or a base, mean effect to impose upon the reader ?

In page 68. the author affects to be witty, and plays upon the words *matters of fact* : poor man, he need not go out of his way to remind the reader that he is an inveterate enemy to *matters of fact*,
there

there is not a page of his appendix, but I have shewn, give ample testimony of this; had he paid the least regard to *facts*, his appendix wou'd never have had a being; for it consists wholly of deceitful forgeries, and misrepresentations, open violation, and defiance of all *matters of fact*. And tho' he is pleased to say, my "matters of fact have been found so very apocryphal" thereby insinuating, I have taken the same unmanly liberties with TRUTH that he has done. I challenge him to point out a single false quotation, misrepresentation, misconstruction, or any art, or design to impress the understanding of the reader with any idea, or conception, contrary to his own most obvious meaning; but the malignant aspersions of a writer who sports with *matters of fact*, on all occasions, the world will pay little regard to. But he goes on, "he saw some scores of acres of
 "as fine meadow as most in England in
 "tillage: Pray where did he see it, let
 "him name the place, and I doubt not
 "of giving within a twelve month a
 "*fairer* account than he has done, &c.

"But

“But let me ask any one’s common sense, if such a fact be possible, without attendant circumstances, that make it a mere exception?” I answer, should he give a *fair* account, ’twill, I think, be a great novelty, a thing he has not been used to. But why does he ask any one’s common sense, if such a fact be possible: Suppose I refer him again to his farmers letters, and to the same passage; then let him ask any one’s common sense, if he cou’d with any propriety, or truth say the unprofitable *practice* of *plowing up pastures* is so *universal* among *farmers*, whenever their landlord’s will allow it, tends perpetually to impoverish them. They are all to a man mad after ploughed lands, and would willingly break up every acre of grass in their farms. I say, let him be asked if he cou’d, with any propriety, or truth, publish this observation, without having seen, or known large quantities of pasture having been thus broken up: cou’d this practice be so universal as to tend perpetually to impoverish the farmers, without many scores of acres having been broke up. Is this a fact? or is it, as usual,

a mere chimera of his own brain? If a fact, why is it not as possible, and at least as probable, that I should see some scores of acres, as that he should see a much larger quantity; a quantity sufficient to justify his assertion, that the practice is so universal, as to tend perpetually to impoverish them; and if the asking, if such a fact be possible; is not virtually a flat contradiction to the universality of the practice he before maintained.

But, Sir, to disarm this apocryphal gentleman of every shadow of a pretext for his aspersive doubts; should he so far neglect the advice of his friends, who desired him not to travel too fast, as to set out on his journey, I should say his *tour* into the West: If he will condescend to visit a small market town in Devonshire, called Chulmleigh, twenty-two miles from Exeter, directly in the turnpike road to Barnstaple; he will find two fine rivers called the Dart, and the Taw; along the banks of which are many fine meadows under tillage at this mo-

moment; and if 'tis not beneath him to make use of my name, he'll find people enough to throw him to the identical meadows; perhaps, this may be the last year some of them may be tilled, because the management of some of them is now under my direction, and I have ordered them to be laid down in grass. — This is the fact, and the tenant has no other inducement to ploughing them, but the hopes of greater advantage; for wheat always sells well in that country, and these rich lands it seems never fail of a crop. Whether they are, or are not, doing what is right in ploughing them up, is another question: but I again aver this to be the fact, notwithstanding his most determined effrontery in saying it is all a romance. As to his venturing totally to deny the possibility of the truth of it, is venturing to deny totally the possibility of his own account in the farmers letters above referred to; but every thing with him is either true or false, as best suits the present circumstance of his argument.

As

As to his question in page 69. to be sure the bounty had nothing to do with the degraded circumstance of his farmers letters. But as he asks a plain question, I will give him an answer, not only as plain, but also as true, as 'tis plain.—I deny that I have any malevolence of temper to the man abstracted from the author; for I know no more of him than he appears to know of me. But I have perhaps a singular way of thinking in regard to author's, and their works. It is, Sir, with them, I think, as with people in business. Some are excellent, and shine in the Zenith; others move in a station less exalted; others are midling; others are honest and well meaning, but unfortunate; at length comes your geniusses who live by their wits, and raise money by imposition, and on various false pretences; and I am very sorry the law has not provided an adequate punishment, for one set of offenders, as well as the other. If an author writes a novel, or a romance, and publishes it

L

under

under that title, the buyer who chuses to amuse himself in that way is by no means disappointed: he has what he intended to buy; but when an author publishes a book, with a specious title, on subjects of great importance to mankind; and the reader upon the perusal finds he has been tricked out of twenty-four shillings, for a work, the intrinsic value of which is not twenty-four pence, it of course raises his indignation, and inclines him to speak his mind freely on the subject; this the author may tax with malevolence; but it certainly is an act of kindness and good will to the rest of mankind. What is said of one book I am sorry to say may be said of many others; but the application is too easy to make any thing further necessary. Now, Sir, give me leave to ask him a question, or two, if the third edition of that work is now printing, has not the same ingenuity, and artifice been used to make it the third, as was taken with the expediency to make it the second? You know that by a small addition, and a new title page, an author

thor may soon make a thirtieth instead of a third edition; and whether he has not made free with the museum, or some other book for another hundred pages. Sincerity and truth are to an author, what honesty and upright dealing are to a man in trade; the want of these necessary qualities in the latter, naturally lead to discredit and bankruptcy; and in the former to universal contempt, neglect, and disgrace.

His censure on my calling his tour *a journey into Wales and the North*, is without wit, or use: If you will turn to his expediency in page 18. you'll find he says in the year 1767, I took a journey into Wales, &c. and a little lower, the year following, I made a similar journey through the North of England; so that you see my account only wants an s at the end of journey to be fully justified by his own account of these momentous tours. He says, he never made such a journey, I answer, that he best knows, perhaps they might be taken on the top

of snowdon, or from an alehouse at the bottom, or from a garret in Field Lane. * He says, in page 30. I give a list of importations from Holland, to shew how the Dutch under sell us, from *cheapness of provisions*. I answer, that again is a *wilful* mistake, for I expressly say in the same page, 'tis chiefly, if not entirely, in the article of labour, which he owns must be high, where provisions are dear, but this is washing the Æthiopian white.

But being now come to almost the last page, this respectable politician seems to be returning to his senses, he tells you in what manner questions of importance should be treated; mentions TRUTH; CANDOUR, AND POLITENESS. What pity it is this should never occur to his mind 'till he is just about to make his exit; it

* See the Monthly Review for April 1770. Art. 23. Page 329.

it sounds like the last dying speech and confession of a man thoroughly conscious, that he had too long neglected those truly amiable qualities in a writer; which, like charity, covers a multitude of sin: had he exercised these in a moderate degree, and treated his reader with common decency in his expediency, who might differ from him in opinion, I never should have furnished an occasion for an appendix. For my part, I don't care what footing this business is put upon, either by the author, or any future writer, provided it does but turn out for the general good. Truth and public emolument is all I contend for; if my sentiments of this business are wrong, I shall be very thankful to the man who furnishes the means of setting me right; but misrepresentation, and wilfully false construction, can never lead to the discovery of truth; indeed they are proofs, that the man who is so mean as to use them, is

not

not seeking after truth, but something else. Interest can have no part in the opinion I have given, because 'twou'd be much more for my interest, that there should, than that there should not be a bounty; but I am so truly sensible, that it so much exceeds, and over-acts the purpose it was originally intended to serve, as to produce all the consequences I have charged upon it; therefore I sincerely wish the legislature wou'd grant a free, and unlimited liberty to export for two or three years without a bounty; and I hope that wou'd be sufficient to demonstrate, that the nation might save 2 or 300,000*l.* per annum. paid some years in bounties, without sustaining the least loss or disadvantage. The experiment wou'd cost nothing the making, and should it prove successful, (of which I have not the least doubt, if it has but a fair chance). It must then be allowed to be a prudent measure;

fure
costs
one
obl
tion
the
nati

sure; infinitely preferable to one, which costs the government very large sums one year, the next perhaps necessity oblige it not only to prohibit exportation, but also to allow importation to the infinite disadvantage and loss of the nation.

AMICUS, PLATO, &c.

F I N I S.

ture; infinitely preferable to one, which
costs the government very large sums
one year, the next perhaps necessarily
oblige it not only to prohibit exports-
tion, but also to allow importation to
the infinite disadvantage and loss of the
nation.



Amicus, Prator, &c.

Vol. I. N. 1. 2.

ture, and
costly
one
obliged
tion,
the
nation.